# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE THE MANUFACTURING COUNCIL Washington, DC

Room 210 Canon House Office Building Washington, DC

Wednesday, May 11, 2005

Gilmour 92 pp.

The meeting was convened, pursuant to notice, at 10:18 a.m., MR. DON WAINWRIGHT, Chairman, presiding.

#### APPEARANCES:

MR. DON WAINWRIGHT Wainwright Industries

HONORABLE DONALD A. MANZULLO U.S. House of Representatives Chairman, Committee on Small Business

MR. ALBERT A. FRINK
Assistant Secretary for Manufacturing
and Services
U.S. Department of Commerce

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

MR. PHILLIP J. BOND
Undersecretary of Commerce
for Technology
U.S. Department of Commerce

MR. MARKOS TAMBAKERAS Kennametal, Inc.

MR. MICHAEL NOWAK
Coating Excellence International

MR. FRED KELLER Cascade Engineering, Inc.

MS. KAREN WRIGHT Ariel Corporation

MR. JAMES McGREGOR Morgan Machine Tool

MR. D. HARDING STOWE R.L. Stowe Mills, Inc.

### ALSO PRESENT:

HONORABLE ROBIN HAYES
U.S. House of Representatives

HONORABLE MARK GREEN
U.S. House of Representatives

HONORABLE SUE MYNRICK U.S. House of Representatives

HONORABLE MIKE TURNER
U.S. House of Representatives

MR. FRANK BARGO

MR. STEVE LEWIS

# TNDEX

INDEX	PAGE
AGENDA ITEM	
MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AND WELCOMING REMARKS By Chairman Wainwright	4
REMARKS By Honorable Albert A. Frink	7
CONGRESSIONAL REMARKS By Honorable Donald A. Manzullo	16
REMARKS By Honorable Phillip Bond	29
SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS	
SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE U.S. WORKFORCE By Mr. Fred Keller	41
SUBCOMMITTEE ON U.S. COMPETITIVENESS By Mr. Michael Nowak	55
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADVOCACY AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE	
By Mr. Markos Tambakeras	72
GENERAL DISCUSSION	78
PUBLIC COMMENTS	88

# 

# P R O C E E D I N G S

By Chairman Wainwright

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Ladies and gentlemen, could we take our seats and start the meeting?

MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AND WELCOMING REMARKS

I would call this meeting to order of the Manufacturing Council. I want to thank everybody for coming, and look forward to comments from both the council and the public. As you know, this is a public hearing. I want to welcome you to Washington, DC.

I want to, first, thank Congressman Manzullo, who is not here at this time but is certainly on his way, for hosting this council meeting on Capitol Hill.

I would also like to thank all of the members of the public for attending, and various manufacturing associations and companies for joining us at the council today for this meeting.

Later in the meeting you will have a chance, of course, as the public are invited guests, to make comments, since this is a public meeting.

Before we begin, I'd like to mention that

Scott Fisk, one of our members on the council, has

resigned. He sold his company recently and feels that,

since he's not running a manufacturing company, that

he'd like to step down. We want to thank him for his

work and his dedication to the council and what he's done for us. So, Scott, good wishes to you and your, I guess, retirement. Thank you for the work you've done for us.

In February, we held a meeting at the Rouge plant in Detroit. Ford hosted that. We were joined by Congressman Thaddeus McCotter; we had Emily Derocco, the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Employment and Training; John Engler, the president of NAM was present also, with Dr. Thomas Dusterburg, who is president and chief executive officer of the MAPI, or Manufacturing Institute Alliance; Dan Danner, senior vice president and CEO of the National Association of Independent Business, NAIB, was also present for that meeting. We had a great discussion and dialogue, not only with council members, but with the public. From each of our invited guests, we learned a lot.

Many of the issues the council deals with, of course, have legislative aspects to them. We have been able to tell the Secretary exactly how manufacturing feels and some of the problems that manufacturing is facing, not only from the standpoint of the council, but from all of our associates in the United States in the manufacturing business.

While the council advises the Secretary on

these things, we are having a meeting today and we will be able to hear from Congress, and they'll be able to hear from the manufacturing sector. So, this is very important that we are located here in Washington, DC today for this meeting, and we look forward to this.

We now have our representative, Secretary of Commerce for Manufacturing and Analysis, Mr. Al Frink, who is our czar for manufacturing and represents manufacturing, and has an office in the Commerce Department.

It is great to have you here, Al. We would like to hear from you now, if we could. Thank you.

7 1 REMARKS By Honorable Albert A. Frink 2 3 MR. FRINK: Sure. Thank you very much, Don. I would like to, first, recognize that Congressman Sue 4 5 Mynrick is here, and thank you for taking the time to be with us. We are very pleased to have you. 6 On behalf of Secretary Guttierrez, I would 7 8 like to welcome all of the council members here to Washington. I'd like to thank this opportunity to 9 thank Chairman Manzullo, who is not here but we hope to 10 see later, for arranging this meeting today. He is a 11 12 passionate supporter of manufacturing. I just want to tell you how much I love this man. 13 CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Congressman, thank you 14 15 for coming. Now, remember, is it Missouri, Missoura, 16 or Manzu? 17 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Try Illinois. 18 CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Try the Marquette Warriors. 19 20 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: No, no. 21

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: You guys did a great job this year.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: The Eagles is what they're politically known as right now.

MR. FRINK: Well, as I was saying --

22

23

2425

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Excuse me, Mr.}$  Secretary.

MR. FRINK: That's quite all right.

He is a passionate supporter of manufacturing. I've seen that firsthand. I'd like to also say a few quick words about Scott Fisk, who as Don mentioned, has resigned from the council.

On behalf of Secretary Guttierrez, I want to thank Scott for his splendid service. He never missed a meeting. He has been a great representative of the plastic industry, as well as the manufacturers in Minnesota. He will be greatly missed.

I was going to try to do something special for him to recognize him as being a charter member of this first council group, and we'll do that, moving forward.

As the President knows, the true power of manufacturing lies in men and women who work in the factories across this great country, producing goods we use every day. It has now been a year since this council was established, and manufacturing truly has a permanent seat at the policy table. Secretary Guttierrez and myself agree, the council represents an invaluable resource and we truly value its advice.

Council membership is diverse, by industry sector and by business size, as it was designed to be.

The administration has benefitted from receiving advice from this council, from large, medium, and small manufacturers in industries ranging from textiles to precious metals, and we have them represented here today.

As a result, we are beginning to address the issues of manufacturing in a very comprehensive manner. For example, in the last year we have addressed the issues of tort reform, health care, and market access.

Let me tell you a little bit about what the council is working on. During the last meeting in February, we heard from the industry associations, as Don mentioned, as well as Assistant Secretary Emily Derocco from Department of Labor.

We received their account of what their members and constituents feel are the issues of the manufacturing community and what we should be focusing on. The Subcommittee on U.S. Workforce continues to work with Emily Derocco on the issues of education, a very passionate focus of all of us.

As I say time and time again from my travels around the country, I see "Help Wanted" signs everywhere I go. But, sadly, we lack a skilled workforce that meets the needs of the 21st century. So, we are going to work to try to fix that.

1 2

On the subject of innovation, Jim Padilla, president of Ford Motor Company and a member of the council, and John Engler, president of the National Association of Manufacturers, both have emphasized the importance of innovation.

As a result, the Subcommittees on U.S.

Competitiveness have taken the issue of innovation and, as I have heard Secretary Guttierrez emphasize on numerous occasions, we need an environment that encourages innovation and promotes risk-taking. It is a definite private sector viewpoint.

Without such an environment, the United States will not continue to be the greatest economy and power in the world. To maintain that position, we must promote innovation in all areas of our society. It requires companies to take risks in research and development. Companies must be able to afford the cost of research and development without having to worry about health care and frivolous lawsuits.

We must also maintain the level playing field for U.S. manufacturing, which is why CAFTA-DR is critical, and we all support that. Eighty percent of the exports from the CAFTA region enter the United States duty-free.

U.S. manufacturers do not currently share in

these benefits, but they will under CAFTA. With this agreement, all remaining tariffs will be phased out over 10 years. CAFTA finally levels the playing field for manufacturers in these countries.

All these issues, as I mentioned, make it possible for American goods and services to compete around the world. I would even take it a step further and say that we not only compete, we win in the international marketplace, and that is what we are tasked to do.

Moving forward in the future requires that we do all we can to preserve the opportunities for American small business owners and entrepreneurs. To achieve this, we must--must--open markets for U.S. goods and services with our neighbors and around the world.

Turning a little bit to the state of the economy, there is a lot of good news. The manufacturing sector has rebounded from a long downturn. We have had 23 months of solid expansion. It is the longest period of growth in 16 years. Productivity is up 2.6 percent in the first three months of this year, and has shown the fastest four-year growth over the last 50 years.

Last Friday, we heard an excellent jobs report

that highlights the strength of the economy. Last month, employers added 274,000 jobs, and I believe the previous two months had revised numbers that added close to another 50,000.

In total, we have added more than 3.5 million new jobs since May of 2003, and we have had 23 straight months of solid job growth. That is more than Canada, France, Germany, Great Britain, and Japan combined.

There are more Americans working today than at any time in history, and the U.S. economy is the fastest-growing industrialized economy in the world. But, while the economy is looking good, if one person is out of a job, we believe we have a lot more work to do.

On the interview front, last month President
Bush, our president, outlined a broad vision to move
America toward a greater energy independence. Also,
Congress recently passed a budget that protects
America, promotes economic growth, and keeps the United
States on track to cut the deficit by 2009. So, there
is a lot of good news coming from the manufacturing
front.

Regarding the recommendations that we are tasked to accomplish--part of my job--we continue to pursue fulfilling the recommendations from the

Manufacturing America report.

We recently appointed Jack McDougal. He joined the Manufacturing Services as our Deputy Assistant Secretary for Industry Analysis. There he is. So, Jack is our new key individual to the efforts of Manufacturing Services and Industry Analysis.

As Deputy Assistant Secretary, Jack will assess the cost competitiveness of American industry and evaluate the impact of domestic and international economic policy on U.S. competitiveness in the manufacturing sector. It is a big job, but Jack is definitely key to do that.

Implementing the report's recommendations requires efforts from many agencies, and for that reason we are developing an inter-agency working group on manufacturing, which Secretary Guttierrez has appointed me as the chair.

This group, which is going to be very valuable, will be comprised of officials from 16 agencies and be responsible for helping to facilitate the implementation of the manufacturing recommendations within the government. They will also help create the initiatives of President Bush's economic agenda as it moves forward.

This group will also give greater strength

through the manufacturing sector within our government, 2 and I look forward to being a part of it. This is one 3 of the key new developments within MAS. So in closing, I am just going to say, 4 clearly, the Manufacturing Council comes to Washington 5 today. They come to a very friendly territory, right? 6 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Yes. 7 8 MR. FRINK: The President, this administration, and Congress are working for 9 manufacturers, and the manufacturers will continue to 10 11 work for you. Manufacturing will continue to be the 12 driving force of the U.S. economy and the preeminent destination for investment throughout the world. 13 14 I thank you. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Mr. Secretary, thank you 15 16 very much. Good report. We appreciate that. 17 Now I would like to introduce a congressman 18 that, you think he's from Montana because it's Manzullo, not Monzula. 19 20 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: It's Mazula. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Mazula. 21 22 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Mazula, Montana. 23 CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: But he's actually from

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Illinois.

the 16th District of Illinois.

2425

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: And he is Chairman of the House Committee on Small Business and serves as Chairman of the Congressional Manufacturing Caucus, also. It is an honor and a privilege to introduce Congressman Manzullo to you.

Congressman, thank you.

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

1

#### CONGRESSIONAL REMARKS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25

By Honorable Donald A. Manzullo

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Well, thank you very much. It's a pleasure to be here.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: You're at a loss for words, there.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Well, it really is. want to try to give a perspective from members of Congress, and also from my congressional district, from somebody who's visited hundreds of facilities around the world, and probably the only member of Congress that's ever gone to warehousing school to study the extraction of raw materials to the manufacturing facility, and then the flow of the finished product into the hands of the consumer. That may seem boring, but when you look at the importance of logistics today, it's extremely important.

We've been doing several things. Our Small Business Committee has held over 60 hearings involving manufacturing. When you look at the other committees that we have here on the Hill, I think they have had a total of two. In fact, we even held hearings on the differences between sectoral productivity and multifactor productivity.

It may seem arcane, but it's extremely

important because the latter has to do with the extent to which foreign parts have been incorporated into the assembly process. So you could increase productivity by putting in cheap Chinese parts, but what do you have?

That does not fulfill the classic economic models, that the more productivity you have, the more jobs you will add. That is called multi-sector productivity. That lags about four to five years behind. Sectoral productivity simply says we could produce the same thing with X many less man hours. We are talking about grease.

We're not talking about figures, we're not talking about statistics. We're talking about real, live human beings, people that get up at 5:00 in the morning, pack their lunches, go off to work, and have to sit there at a machine, trying to figure out how to make that thing work better.

In the classic sense, that's what we know as productivity. But I would not be thrilled with the statistics that talk about, we're increasing our productivity, unless we truly understand that if it's the result of lean manufacturing, just-in-time, people becoming 9000-9002 certified, and in our district, AS-9100 certified, so they could compete in the aerospace

industries, then you have an opportunity to see that the manufacturing sector has some viability to it.

What the Secretary didn't say, was that we lost 16,000 manufacturing jobs in the last month, mostly in the textile industry and in the furniture industry. The Chinese now dominate the furniture makers in this country. They are probably now at about 60 to 65 percent of all of the case goods of furniture.

When you lose your furniture manufacturing, you lose the guys that make the machine tools, such as Black Manufacturers in Madota, Illinois who make the machines for it. So the more we lose a share in different sectors, the thing backs up like a sewer. What is bothering me, is the fact that I do not think things are as rosy out there in manufacturing as the indicators show. The reason for that, is that the orders are not long-term.

The President erred horribly with playing politics on steel, especially stainless steel, which still has a tariff on it. Hot-rolled steel still has a tariff on it. It really did a tremendous amount of harm to my manufacturers, who are heavily into tool and die and in the fastener industry.

So, you try to look at, are things better than they were a year ago in manufacturing? Absolutely.

Our orders are up tremendously. What's going on in mining because of the demand for energy? Caterpillar is going wild. They cannot get enough people to make stuff for them. Doug Kett has a \$150,000 million presence in my congressional district through the subs and the sub-subs there.

I just saw in the paper, now there's a big problem trying to get tires big enough to put on the big machines that are used to haul the coal that's been extracted from the mines.

The other thing I wanted to talk about, is the inter-agency workforce that has been set up. I think this is extremely significant, and let me give you a good example of it.

I was at the Cast Expo in St. Louis, the foundrymen and the tool and die people put that on, 900 booths, 9,000 people showed up. That was a week that I spent there. I was with the heat treaters in Tucson, and with the diminishing supply folks from DoD and Nashville. It was a long week, but I spent it on manufacturing.

And one of the things that Phil Bond's group is trying to do, is to have a definitive place where you can find out exactly who's doing what in research and development in this country. We don't have that

now.

I helped set up back home what's called the Eiger Lab. It's a consortium of three universities with process and research engineers, along with Angel Capital, so you can take somebody with an idea right through commercialization. We are specializing there in something that's called micro-manufacturing.

For example, here is a beautiful spur gear that's milled with a carbide tip on a spindle, on essentially a dental drill, going about 120,000 rpms. It doesn't need to have any cleaning up at the end of it. It's less than the size of Lincoln's nose on this penny.

At one time, to do something like that -- or you could take a 1 millimeter piece of aluminum like this, take a CAD-CAM, take a picture of a frag, and then relief, actually mill this process. Once we could only do it with an EDM, a wire machine.

Well, I found out in St. Louis that Honeywell and Kansas City have something called a list, or a birth technology that's been borrowed from the Germans, whereby they're doing the very same thing on these gears.

Now, this is a spur gear. You could probably do a helio gear on it, or even a worm gear, because the

precision on it is so exact. Now, how did I know that somebody else was getting DoD funds and doing the very same thing, but with a different process, hopefully for a different application?

It's because I live at those shows. To me, going to a machine tool show is like a kid with new toys. It's to see the genius of the people that are involved in plastics, and composites, and metal, and stuff like that.

What I see taking place now, is when you look at the matrix that's set up with the four areas:

Committee on Environment and Natural Resources;

Committee on Science; Committee on Technology;

Committee on Homeland and National Security. Under manufacturing research and development, it doesn't make sense to duplicate R&D across the country.

I've read this report on competitiveness, and I appreciate it. But don't come to Washington asking for more money. It's not here. Okay? I met with Jim Padilla. It's not here, you guys. There is no more money to give you. Okay? I'm just telling you that right now. I take as much as I can and I shove it in my district. That's part of being a representative.

 $\label{eq:But the goal in here, and as I read this on} \\$  here, competitiveness, and I told my aide today, I

said, look, don't come up with an action point being, asking Congress for more research and development money. It's not here. This is the answer. It's this, the inter-agency working group, that will definitely tell you who's working on what and using what process.

The last thing I want to talk about -- well, I just want to be brutally up front, especially with the multi-national corporations. Here it is: you cannot set up overseas operations for research and development on one hand, and then complain on the other hand about a lack of people going into engineering in this country.

I will tell you what the guys are telling their kids: the jobs are going to India, China and Poland, so why should you go into engineering? I mean, I hear it all the time. All the time. I know they're setting up product, R&D centers, in Singapore.

Then sitting down with me and saying,

Congressman, we need more money for research and

development, aaah! And the reason it's the wrong

message, is that you have made a commitment at that

point to ship R&D overseas. This nation has already

lost its technological edge. It's gone. It's gone.

If you look at the great machine tool companies in this country, you've got one machine tool

company left, and that's Hauss out in California.

National Tooling in Ohio went into Chapter 11. The Pentagon didn't know about it. It's the last company in the country that makes a cold-forming machine.

That's important, because that machine makes bullets.

So, we had nobody left in this country that was making those machine tools. It was gone.

That brings me to the next point. That is, the Pentagon is doing everything it can to send as much manufacturing and shifting R&D overseas as possible.

Now, you are probably all familiar with the so-called Buy American Act.

People say, we're in total compliance with the Buy American Act. Do you know what that means? You could be in total compliance with the Buy American Act and have zero percent American quantity product in it. Zero percent.

If you look at the Lockheed Martin helicopter agreement, where the Pentagon thinks nothing of entering into an agreement with Augusta-Westland, which is 32 percent owned by the Italian government, they control the board of directors, it's a socialist company, they're expected to go head-to-head with United Technologies in this country, which is run on a free market basis.

1 But I just want to share all these things with you because things are not going that well in Congress 2 3 with regard to what we see in the loss of our jobs. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Mr. Congressman, thank 4 you very much. I see you haven't slowed down any up 5 here. You're doing your job. 6 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: I had some more toys to 7 8 share with you, but that will be enough for now. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Well, we appreciate it. 9 10 Thank you for your remarks. Thank you for hosting 11 this. We always know that you're the watchdog up here 12 for manufacturing, and we appreciate everything you do. Are there any questions from anybody on the 13 14 council for the Congressman? 15 (No response) 16 CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Surely that was enough 17 to provoke anybody on this council. Please. Markos? 18 Yes? MR. TAMBAKERAS: I'm hoping the Congressman 19 20 will be here for our discussion later, because a lot of 21 those products that you just brought out in your packet 22 is what we do. 23 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Right.

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

metalworking major company left in this country.

2425

MR. TAMBAKERAS: And we are the last

MR. TAMBAKERAS: Yes. Right. Absolutely.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Right. Right.

MR. TAMBAKERAS: And there is a significant issue--we'll be talking about and elaborating shortly--about tungsten in China.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Okay.

MR. TAMBAKERAS: We have seen a five-fold increase of the price of tungsten in six weeks. Eighty percent of it comes from China. That goes in every tool and is used in every machine that is machining anything in this country.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Well, we got into that with titanium. We had to get all of the Pentagon because they were servicing it from Washington and Trane, and the three titanium manufacturers were going nuts.

Also, we helped file a Short Supply Petition on behalf of the brass people when we thought the Chinese were gobbling up the copper scrap market. The day we filed the petition, the Chinese backed off on it. But I'd be glad to talk to you about this issue.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Well, the one thing about this, is this affects all those materials.

1 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: That's right. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Because this material 2 3 goes into the cutting tools that machine those 4 materials. MR. TAMBAKERAS: Every machining operation uses them. 6 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: What's important about 7 8 it is, under the Brady Act, which the Defense 9 Department has to comply with--I've just got to show 10 you this--unless some jerk over these decided to have 615,000 American-made berets, berets made in China. 11 There were 614,999 of these that are rotting 12 in a warehouse in Mechanicsburg, Pennsylvania, and I've 13 14 got the other one here. But what had happened was, they signed this Brady waiver. Tungsten is a precious 15 metal. Under the law, any order by the Pentagon must 16 17 have U.S. tungsten in it. You can't import it. But 18 I'd be glad to talk to you about that. MR. TAMBAKERAS: We have a solution here 19 20 because we have stockpiles that we can access that can 21 stabilize the market quickly. 22 CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Good. Good.

MR. TAMBAKERAS: But we need some action,

which we will be talking about later.

23

24

25

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: Good.

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: So, thank you very much.

Go ahead.

MR. STOWE: Just in terms of mentalities at the Department of Defense, what is the rationale for -CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: They call it best value. It's garbage. I talked to the general that came up with that term, "best value." What they have done, they have effectively skirted around the Buy American Act, because that says it's got to be 51 percent American content, and then the DoD signed MOUs with 26 countries that said, if we buy from you, it's the American equivalent.

So ,you could have 100 percent German parts in there and fulfill the Buy American Act. The Pentagon did that purposely, not just because of shortages, but because of the commercialization going on and you want to use commercialized products as much as possible in a defense posture. That's okay, but you can't keep on avoiding the laws. That's what hurts a lot of us, such as our printed circuit board people that have been wiped out.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Congressman.

I would like to now introduce Phil Bond, Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology. Under Secretary

Bond serves as the principal advisor to Secretary Guttierrez on science and technology policy.

Technology administration seeks to maximize technology's contribution to America's economic growth. In this context, Mr. Bond's primary responsibility is serve policy development and direction among the Office of Technology and Policy, the National Institute of Standards and Technology, and the National Technical Information Services.

Congressman Bond, thank you very much for giving us your time.

MR. FRINK: Before Phil starts, I would like to have the council recognize and thank Congressman Mark Green of Wisconsin for being here. We thank you very much for attending this council meeting.

1

## REMARKS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24 25 By Honorable Phillip Bond

MR. BOND: Thank you, Mr. Secretary, thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I drew the short straw and had to follow Don Manzullo.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: I tried to get you ahead, but I don't know what happened.

MR. BOND: Yes. I appreciate it. I was tempted to say that Chairman Manzullo read that thing about out inter-agency group just the way I wrote it, but anybody who knows Don Manzullo knows you don't put words in his mouth. So, I appreciate him drawing attention to that.

I'd like to walk you through a little bit this effort on an inter-agency basis to look at manufacturing R&D. Just as Al Frink personifies the commitment to manufacturing in the near and middle terms, this inter-agency group really personifies the longer term commitment of the administration.

(Showing of slides)

MR. BOND: I want to walk you through some of our work there, which takes place--and you've got hard copies for the council members--under the aegis of the National Science and Technology Council. What is that? I'll cover that a little bit later, but it's really

just the coordinating body within the White House where we can bring together the work going on on an interagency basis.

(Changing of slides)

MR. BOND: This, of course, was one of the action items called for in the Manufacturing America report to put together an inter-agency effort to look at the longer term. So you see in the bullets there that it does serve as a forum to address manufacturing R&D policy, programs, and budget guidance.

It promotes exchange in the leverage of information. This is what Chairman Manzullo was referring to, trying to break down those infamous silos and share what's going on.

Everybody pursues their budgets individually, and sometimes we don't share the information and what's going on in the different labs. We're trying to end that.

There was a similar effort that many folks in this room know about called GATE-M, the Government Agencies Technology Exchange and Manufacturing Effort. This builds rather dramatically on that by incorporating many more members. In fact, the next slide shows you the participating agencies.

Really, across the board there you see the

various agencies, including the SBA, which is important, as we'll talk about later, but also the White House Office of Management and Budget, so that they're fully aware of what we're doing, and the Office of Science and Technology Policy.

(Changing of slides)

MR. BOND: We have a formal charter and we have these functions which, again, are to:

- \* Promote communication
- \* To facilitate these programs
- \* To expedite manufacturing R&D
- \* To report to the Committee on
  Technology, which is part of this
  Science and Technology Council
- \* And do as the DOC Manufacturing Report said, to have interface here as one of our private sector inputs to make sure that what we do on the Federal side is relevant not only to the Federal agencies and their missions, but relevant to where the private sector sees the future of manufacturing.

(Changing of slides)

 $$\operatorname{MR.}$$  BOND: So, we do have, as the next slide shows, some private sector interface through the

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology. We are allowed to interact and receive ad hoc advice from various private sector groups, and we will talk about that a little bit more as we move ahead to the next slide, please.

(Changing of slides)

MR. BOND: We have been meeting now for about a year on a monthly basis. Our main focus, first, was to establish some technical priorities, to define the challenges, and especially the gaps, as we compared notes among the Federal agencies, and to then propose solutions.

We have heard from the private sector and from key public sector players the Next Generation

Manufacturing Technology Initiative is a consortium of some of the associations who are active in next generation manufacturing.

The Partnership for 21st Century Skills is really getting to the education needs for a 21st century manufacturing base.

NIST's MEP program. That is a part of the bureau I oversee at Commerce, so we are fully plugged in and integrated there. The same goes for NIST Manufacturing Engineering Lab, where some of the cutting edge work is going on and the new machining

systems and intelligence systems.

DoD, of course, is a key player, making sure we keep a manufacturing base and supply chains available for their needs; as much domestic as possible, Chairman Manzullo.

From OSTP on the hydrogen and fuel cell, and from SBA, because they are the administrator of \$2 billion of Federal research through the SBIR and STTR programs.

This has resulted in some significant crossagency communication, in exchange, driving to that goal that Chairman Manzullo talked about, to really be able to get our arms around what everyone is doing in one place, and spend that one dollar as wisely as we can.

We did have a public forum, the last bullet there, in March to receive some feedback from NAM and NFIB, and many of the other players in the public square from the private sector on this. I can tell you that the feedback we received there was generally quite positive and supportive of our identified priorities.

(Changing of slides)

MR. BOND: What we want to do here, as we do in many of the inter-agency efforts through the NIST, is end up with a report from the President's Science Advisor that captures the input, the priorities, and

the gaps, and so forth and put that out in the public square. Then that translates into guidance for the agencies as they prepare their future budgets. So, we are trying to drive some prioritization.

(Changing of slides)

MR. BOND: These are the three technical areas we identified as gaps and some common areas we need to move in for the missions of the agencies, and received positive input on the mission of the private sector: intelligent and integrated manufacturing systems.

Imagine what a competitive advantage it would be if our machinery not only was working at the micro or nano scale that Chairman Manzullo talked about, but if it was self-healing and intelligent; if each piece of machinery and each step of the manufacturing process was intelligent and wired to the rest of the supply chain, so that if there was a breakdown somewhere in the supply chain, all of the relevant players and machinery for those players in the supply chain knew it and could make necessary adjustments. That's the kind of intelligent and integrated system that we want to drive toward for our national security needs, homeland security needs. If you have a surge, you want intelligent machines dispersed around the country to be able to understand the need and act efficiently and

quickly. Think what that would mean to all machine tools.

Manufacturing for the hydrogen economy. Of course, we have a huge national initiative for the hydrogen economy. What we are trying to do, is dive deeper on what that means for manufacturing down the supply chains across the country, not just at the proof of concept, but moving then into what it means throughout the supply chain: autos, but also for distributed systems, back-up systems. National security and homeland security again enter the equation there.

Then nano manufacturing. This is going to mean not only ultimately completely new ways to engineer and manufacture, but it's going to mean new capabilities. Think of tools, think of metals with new properties, being able to engineer from the bottom up. So there, too, a national initiative is in place.

But we want to go beyond proof of concept into, what are the real needs that you find at the grassroots? What are people identifying as places that we need some more research and development, enable to hand it off to the private sector and let you create value, jobs and wealth.

(Changing of slides)

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

MR. BOND: There is one other area that I want you to know about beyond the technical priorities that we have organized ourselves around, and that is following up on the President's executive order to encourage R&D in the SBIR program. Again, that's about a \$2 billion commitment for smaller, higher risk, innovative research programs around the country in the private sector.

What we're trying to do, is make sure that we have a taxonomy for all Federal agencies to use and look at that can dive into the SBIR grant program and understand what R&D is going on right now that they might find relevant.

That means finding all of the terms that are important to manufacturers and making them searchable. Those terms are changing. I don't have to tell this council that those terms are changing.

So you might simply look up something like manufacturing and it would not show up in the R&D proposal, that particular word, so you've got to go to the next level.

What are some of those words that might popup? Maybe you'd see a radio frequency identification R&D, so you want to search for RFID, or nano scale, or pico scale, or whatever the next generation of

capabilities are going to be.

So, we are going to prepare that for all agencies. It would be a desk-top item for Federal agencies to be able to quickly search and find out what research is going on.

Again, getting back to Chairman Manzullo's point, we have to spend the available dollars as wisely as possible, which means not spending them two, three, or four times on the same research.

(Changing of slides)

MR. BOND: Last slide, next steps. We do want to incorporate all of this feedback into our report, which we want to have done by fall, or even summer, of this year. The taxonomy, I have told you about.

Then we want this to result ultimately in guidance going out as Federal agencies prepare their budgets, to know that the view of OMB, the Director of the Budget and the President's Advisor on Science, that these are the priorities that we are looking for and that they're going to be coordinated, information is going to be shared, and we will then compare notes on an inter-agency basis so that we can assist all the agencies in spending those dollars as wisely as possible in ways that help the private sector as much as possible so that we can lead the world in this

technological capability.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Mr. Secretary, thank you very much. Outstanding report.

One of the questions I would have, and I want the council to also ask some questions, but I'll lead off here, what is the tie between our manufacturing czar in our office there with you and what you've done to make sure that we're connected with you?

MR. BOND: Well, I made a real oversight in not reciting that at our public forum, Secretary Frink was not only one of the keynoters, but stayed for, I think, the entire day's presentation and discussion.

I'd like to say that our efforts are joined at the hip. I think we are working incredibly closely, both on a personal level, but also through our staffs, through sharing the information coming out of the last at NIST with both Al's operation, as well as us on the technology side. We have a representative of Al's office on our inter-agency working group. So, we are completely joined.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay. And is that tied in with Jack's operation also then, so we've got the data we need on this sort of thing, too? Because this is really important.

1 MR. BOND: Absolutely. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: I know, within our own 2 Commerce Department there, we've got to make sure we're 3 4 talking there, too. MR. BOND: Right. 5 MR. FRINK: I think we're going to become more 6 integrated as we move forward. I hadn't asked Phil, 7 8 but I think at some of the future inter-agency meetings, I'd like to be able to attend --9 MR. BOND: An open invitation to you. 10 MR. FRINK: -- to be able to see the workings 11 12 of how it's working, so I can make sure we are doing just exactly what you said. 13 CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Any other questions from 14 15 anybody else on the council? 16 (No response) 17 CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Mr. Secretary, thank you 18 very much. It was fantastic. Of course, the only way we can compete in this global market is through 19

technology advancement. It's very important that we have that on our agenda. So, thank you very much.

MR. BOND: Thank you.

20

21

22

23

24 25

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: As I mentioned earlier, the meeting of the council involved discussions on education and retraining and innovation. Such topics, we've delegated to our council, of course, through
subcommittees.

Now I would like to hear from Fred Keller, who is the Chairman of the Subcommittee on U.S. Workforce. Would you give a little briefing on your report, Fred, please? Thank you.

# 

#### SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

### SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE U.S. WORKFORCE

By Mr. Fred Keller

MR. KELLER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary. Congressman Manzullo, thank you very much, on behalf of the other council members.

I am going to try to be brief, but we have come across, I think, a very interesting area for us to actually sink our teeth into as council members and would like to just cover a few points that we have found as a result of your good work in having Assistant Secretary Emily Derocco visit with us last time when we were in Dearborn.

So as a result of Assistant Secretary Derocco being with us at the last meeting, conversations with her and her staff have led us to feeling that we have a very active, and potentially exciting, relationship with Department of Labor in helping them in their mission to, in their words, create a demand-driven workforce system that is to ensure, in their words, no worker is left behind.

It is important for us to recognize that this is an opportunity for us. They've got \$15 billion. We are not asking for more money in this case,

Representative Manzullo. We are merely asking it to be

redirected.

It is important for manufacturers to organize with training providers to propose local solutions to those kinds of needs that we have that are unique to the manufacturing sector.

There is a high-growth job training initiative that has been under way. They've done some initial granting on that, and the Department of Labor is considering future rounds and inviting us to participate in structuring that.

The community-based job training initiative, which is 225 million dollar grants going out this year, focusing on the work that community colleges can do to which many manufacturers are already connected, to be able to see if we can't figure out a more effective way to have training happen for manufacturing. Assistant Secretary Derocco was asking us to participate in helping to design an even more effective grant-making process for manufacturing.

There is an annual Workforce Innovations

Conference being held in Philadelphia in July, just

right around the corner. This will be featuring our

own Assistant Secretary Frink.

Hopefully, Al, I think you're being invited. Governor Engler is going to be speaking, the president

of the National Association of Manufacturers, and I know that Secretary Guttierrez is also invited to be a part of this.

Congress is working right now on reauthorizing the Workforce Investment Act. We certainly are interested in seeing that that continue to pass. I guess this has been going on continuing resolutions now for about three years, and hopefully this year it will be reauthorized. We are anxious to be able to hear anything about that. So, we've got some recommendations.

One, is that we develop a rather comprehensive plan, that you charge our committee—and I would add that our committee just got a little thinner as Scott Fisk, who has been doing great work with us, has resigned, so we would need an additional one or two posts on our committee to help with that.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: We're going to see what $$ \text{we can do about that, Fred.} $$$ 

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  KELLER: I'll be looking for additional help.

But we would recommend that this committee be charged with coming up with a comprehensive plan for ensuring that manufacturing sectors' retraining needs be met by the Department of Labor and through the

Workforce Investment Act.

Secondly, we would suggest that we would be able to work with some appropriate designated staff at DOC. We need some staffing help from this to be able to have a comprehensive plan work, so we'd ask for that.

We would ask that we develop a report to the manufacturing sector so it isn't just something that we design here on the Manufacturing Council, but we actually disseminate some report at a broader segment that could be easily accessed.

Finally, developing a longer range report on the most effective methodology for retraining. My suspicion is that we are following a model that may be somewhat flawed, in the idea that we can simply train people up and they're ready to be placed into business. We need to be doing more just-in-time work that is more relative to what is happening on the job so that people are being assigned to work and learning on the job.

We all know the decay time for retention is very quick, and we've got to figure out systems that are going to do that better. So that would be the focus of some work that we might do together.

Actually, we think we might be able to have some funding from foundations to be able to work with

the Department of Labor and having something like this drawn together. So, that would be the substance of what we're recommending in the first part.

The second thing we'd recommend, is that we would perhaps entertain—and we can talk about it at this table—the idea of having our next meeting, July 12th, which the Department of Labor would be happy to host at the Workforce Innovations Conference, which will be in Philadelphia, and that we could actually have our next meeting there, and to really highlight this issue of workforce retraining and be able to work together with Department of Labor to do such. So, that would be the substance of what we're recommending. I'd like to have comments and dialogue.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay. Anybody on the council have any comments, any discussion on Fred's report, and recommendations? Jim?

MR. McGREGOR: Don, I would like to also like to request that we try to at least participate. If we can't have a meeting in Philadelphia with Emily's group, that we try to, at least some of us, participate in that meeting to make sure that our message gets across to her area that's going to be involved in this conference. So, I would just ask that we do the best we can to support that.

MR. FRINK: I would echo Jim's recommendation. We had talked about the next council meeting being in September at Caterpillar at their facility.

MR. KELLER: Right.

MR. FRINK: And whether or not the council wants to add another meeting before that so soon will be something the group will have to make a decision on. But I do believe, if not --

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Why don't we talk about that at another point?

MR. FRINK: That would be fine.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Jim, on your point, as far as implementation, I'd like to hear from our Secretary of Manufacturing, as far as the subcommittee is concerned, the work that they've done—the good work they've done on this—how does this go into an action plan now? We've got recommendations. We've come to you, and now you'll go to the Secretary with this information, I suppose.

MR. FRINK: Our role, your role, is to provide advice to the Secretary. I would put a strong, well-worded white paper together on that, first to myself. Part of my efforts, with Emily Derocco, is to work on establishing an Education Council.

The issues that are within Fred's

recommendations from his subcommittee would be looked at in that council to begin a plan of implementation. The idea would be to create a model that we could use to apply to the entire country, because the issues of unemployment are, with few exceptions, very consistent throughout the United States.

We need retraining, we need education, K-12, awareness. We need to market education opportunities in the manufacturing sector. So, it's a comprehensive effort that we're going to formulate in a committee effort, and so I'd probably defer to be able to give you the exact road map, but give you progress reports on that as it comes together.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: And I think that's outstanding. The thing that Secretary Bond mentioned, the technology you brought up, just reinforces the educational standpoint from manufacturers around the country.

And as we represent our constituencies on this council, we want to make sure that our Manufacturing Secretary understands how important this is, and also for you to take to the Secretary of Commerce some of these ideas so that we can make sure that we're not just telling you about what we have, but we want to make sure some of these things are going to start to

bear fruit.

MR. FRINK: It's at the top of my priority list, personally in my job and as a part of the oversight of the council, speaking to the jobs that are lost. That is a big concern, for sure. We cannot be anything but passionately concerned about that. Our efforts to do a job of educating and reeducating is going to be very helpful to the job market at the manufacturing level in reversing those numbers.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you, sir.

Mr. Secretary?

MR. BOND: Yes. I just wanted to offer one note of information for the council and create some more work for Al Frink.

MR. FRINK: Thank you.

MR. BOND: The Federal Government is so vast. There is another inter-agency working group looking at advanced technologies for education and training, built in large part on a project started a couple of years ago with Commerce and education for the kind of general educational needs, especially looking at K-12, and looking at where, if technology is really applied to the individual learning systems of people, and so forth, what could it do?

In the course of setting up a similar inter-

agency effort there to find out what was going on, well, DoD is a world leader in online training and just-in-time delivery of training to re-skill and refresh skills.

So, Al, that's another inter-agency group we need to get you plugged into as we try to break down those silos and take advantage of the research that the military has already done.

MR. FRINK: At DoD.

MR. BOND: At DoD, to deliver information in individualized learning styles. Two people may go to get the same training course and have it presented, if I'm an oral learner or visual learner, have it presented the way they best would do that on a just-intime basis, as mentioned. So, one more inter-agency effort that I think will tie in nicely with Al's work.

MR. FRINK: Well, you know, the inter-agency group that we're going to be establishing specifically for manufacturing under the Secretary will have Department of Defense, and other agencies, included, Education, Labor, all of them. That agency is going to be tasked with moving forward the recommendations in the manufacturing report, so we'll bring the collective efforts of all that input.

I think one of the things, speaking to

Congressman Manzullo's concern about costs--which are justified; we don't have money--one of the first things we'll be doing, is to look at what other efforts are in place with regard to education so that we're not replicating and duplicating, but we can find a course that's clean and focused that needs some manufacturing, because that's what we're tasked with.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay.

Congressman?

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: If I could just make a point.

Fred, you're right on. Sometimes I think that the workforce, training, and all the different programs we have become employment programs for retrainers.

People are being trained in a vacuum. We have a fellow back home that wants to add a second shift. He can't find EDM operators, can't find CNC operators.

The biggest problem--and you can talk to Chris Kane from IBM--they have their own in-house consulting firm, Price Waterhouse Cooper, and IBM tasked their own consulting firm to identify the jobs that IBM would have two years from now so they could work with the community colleges in order to train the people.

The most they could come up with was one year, because technology is changing so quickly. Knowledge

at one time was discovered, today it's invented.

That's how fast this pace is. You've got to jump 10 years ahead, and then move backwards and fill in.

That's the challenge out there. But what I would suggest, Fred, is people back home, Don Buzicross can't find his EDM operators.

He should be able to pick up the phone, call one of those half dozen groups and say, would you train for me a person for this position, and work with them? It has to be specialized. You just can't train people in large pools and expect to tap those pools because technology has moved so fast on them.

MR. KELLER: I think that's the idea, conceptually, that everyone could agree with. It's the implementation of it.

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: But where you have to start, is from the industry perspective. You have to bring in Caterpillar, or the guys that are here, and say, let's go to the line, and then work backwards. Because now we're working academically and governmently, and then we're trying to go to the line and it's not working then.

MR. KELLER: Right. They can't get there fast enough.

MR. McGREGOR: Our issue, a big issue with us,

is just what you're talking about, Mr. Chairman. One of our issues that we look at very seriously relating to this, is some of these people we want to train are already employed. They're incumbent workers. We need to get their training and their skill levels higher. I think one of the things that Fred and our committee is mentioning here, is as we look at where these dollars are going, we aren't asking for more dollars, but we want to know, are we utilizing these dollars the best they can be utilized to be survivors of the future?

I think these processes -- you're absolutely right. If we get a new process that comes in, in a matter of months or a year's time, then the providers want to take years to tell us how to train to it. We don't have years, you know.

MR. KELLER: Right.

MR. McGREGOR: So a lot of us are going out and developing our own programs for our own survival. But to be globally competitive, are we going to be able to do that forever?

MR. KELLER: The comment would be a follow up just a little bit. The DOL really wants to be able to work with us now, and I don't want to let the perfect get in the way of the good. I think we've got to jump on this and take advantage of it if we can at this

point.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay. Let's get some comments from the public now. I'd like to open it up to the public. Are there any comments from our guests here?

MR. FRINK: John, I would like to also, if I could, just interject a second and would like to recognize, and have the council recognize, that Congressman Robin Hayes has joined us. We thank you very much for being here with us.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you, sir.

Now, let me open it up to the public. Do we have any comments from any of the public on radio or here in the audience on this particular subject?

Congressman?

CONGRESSMAN HAYES: Thank you, John. Thank all of you all for being here. Being part of the public, too, I want to welcome you into our crazy city of Washington, and remind you as you look at the vital necessity of maintaining a strong industrial manufacturing base in this country.

We are just about to mark up the defense bill, which some people refer to Buy America. Keep it on that, because it says the military will buy Americanmade goods and services. If we don't support our own

folks, then our ability to have the goods and services we need in times such as this is badly compromised. You can help us.

I want to remind you that all of our wonderful soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines wear underwear and socks, use towels and tee shirts. So, it's vitally important. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you, sir. Appreciate your comments.

Any other comments from anybody in the public?
(No response)

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay. If not, it seems the council seems to be in agreement on this, that this is very important and we ought to move ahead with this letter. Do I have agreement that, if there are any objections, that we propose to send a letter to Secretary Guttierrez through our Secretary and make sure that this is on the agenda? Is there agreement on that? Okay.

At this time, I'd like to call on Mike Nowak to give his report on the Subcommittee on U.S. Competitiveness. This is very important for us to stay alive in the global market.

Mike, can we hear from you?

## 

# SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON U.S. COMPETITIVENESS

By Mr. Michael Nowak

MR. NOWAK: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As you said, the Subcommittee on U.S.

Competitiveness felt that research and development is key for us to lead into the 21st century. You have the report there--which I will try to answer any concerns about--that talks about the innovation, technology, and process advancement that we need to make in order for us to stay competitive as we move into the 21st century.

Just as a little bit of background. First, we have seen manufacturing employment decline. We're out there trying to compete with people who are paying wages that are 5 to 10 percent below us. We believe one of the keys to offsetting that is R&D, and how do we develop process that are lean and able to employ people here at the kind of salaries they need to make a living wage?

In that framework, we have also seen R&D spending, while it's maintained its overall percent of GDP, it's really switched from being more government supported to being more industry supported.

We have also seen a pretty big shift in where

R&D dollars are spent. Today, about 81 percent of R&D spending in the U.S. is on defense and on medical sciences. That is a huge number, when you compare it to other places like Japan, France, Germany, and the U.K., who spend much less money on those areas and much more on basic research and on supporting the manufacturing environment.

I'm not sure we're asking for more money. I think what we're asking for is a reallocation. Now, some of that defense spending does result in products that go to manufacturers eventually, but again, I think we've seen a decline in how much we support basic R&D.

We've also seen a decline in the interest in science and engineering fields, as the Congressman pointed out. Some of that could come from overseas, participation, but I think it's a chicken-and-the-egg situation.

We've seen that decline happen, I think, over many years. The last data we had was back in 2000, which showed that we already had less engineering and science degrees issued versus many of our competing countries out there as a percent of total degrees.

There just doesn't seem to be the interest these days in going into science and engineering that we had in the days when you had the space race and

everything else, and it was the thing to do. Along with the initiative on training, we need to really get our younger generation interested in those steps.

So, we've made a number of recommendations of what we believe would improve the R&D environment.

Again, I don't think most of them include any incremental dollars. It may mean switching things around. Or, as I guess when I read the papers about Washington and the accounting, many times it goes over five years. So, maybe it's an investment now that gets paid back in the next two or three.

But, first, I think we need to recognize that small business in this country employs a lot of people, number one. Number two, a lot of innovation comes from small business because, really, if they don't develop that new product, they don't have a business.

Yet, I think there are some things that we do that discourage them. Certainly the Manufacturing Extension Partnership is a benefit in small business, but there are a number of tax policies that could encourage more business investment and expansion and use of R&D.

Two of those would be the accelerated depreciation that went away this year. It certainly accelerate the amount small businesses could spend over

the five- or seven-year timeframe. There's really no loss in taxes.

The R&D credits. Being a small business myself, I can tell you, we've never taken an R&D credit because I've been told my investors lose money when I do it. That seems like a heck of a tax incentive to do R&D when I have to pay more because I don't want to take advantage of it.

The second point, is to permanently extend the current R&D tax credits, which I believe ended the end of this year. That would help all manufacturers. And to make them realistic, that everyone could take advantage of them, would help all manufacturers promote R&D within their organizations.

Third, the patent reform initiatives. These days, we see many more applications than we're getting through the patent office. Patent experience can take three years, if you're pretty lucky, to being five, six, seven years sometimes to get a patent issued. It's very costly and, like I say, the wait is very long. Support in that regard would help us to encourage people to make R&D investments so that they'd be protected.

Going along with the prior report, prioritizing funding to upgrade skills of our workers,

particularly at the university level, where we can get more engineers and science graduates, but also in the elementary and manufacturing apprenticeship programs, which I think they talked about adequately.

Lastly, promote innovation in health care.

One of the ways—and we've started to see a lot of this, at least in my part of the country—is how do we apply technology more to the health care industry to try to reduce costs and bring them under control?

Health care continues to be a major, major cost for all U.S. industry, and it's a cost that we really don't have as we compete against many of our foreign competition.

Those are short-term recommendations. In the long term, we'd like to see Congress and the President champion a vision that supports U.S. R&D initiatives, and that research for manufacturing returns to a level that is consistent with the GDP.

Now, that doesn't mean necessarily spending more money, but either through inter-agency working groups or through just shifting some of the investment, that we invest in our future as a manufacturing company.

That's really brought us wealth over the history of this nation, and I think we need to get back

there if we're going to continue to expand and have a good, vibrant economy.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Mike, thank you very much. Yes, I agree with you. You guys did a great job on this report. Counter to some of the things we hear, our percentage of the GDP for R&D is tremendously low.

So, we're living off the investments we made 40 years ago. That's where we are now. We've got to get ready for the next 40 years and get this thing turned around so that we're in the world economy. As far as R&D is concerned, that's a tough fight.

Are there any comments from anybody on the council?

MR. TAMBAKERAS: If I may.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Markos?

MR. TAMBAKERAS: I think there is a sense of urgency with this that may not be entirely appreciated. These battles are fought on a daily basis. If you lose an advantage, it takes you a long time to get it back, if you ever do.

It is perhaps -- global, but not too far from the truth that today certain schools of engineering, the graduate schools, 40 percent of the graduates are foreign students who are coming here, and particularly in the areas like IT, for example, and certain other disciplines.

We are trying to hire a lot of these students, because if you need a short-term fix, then you're going to find an engineer and a qualified graduate, and then we try to see how we can leverage that capability because there's a shortage of engineering.

In many ways, the culture has lost valuing engineering. So in addition to credits and other things, we need to work in any way we can to raise again the value at the family level, that being an engineer is, again, honorable. In a lot of these countries we are competing against, engineering is very highly valued and it's a cultural aspect.

But certainly as a short-term fix, we are hiring, when we can, wherever we can, and many of them are foreign students who graduate from my universities because we can still provide a very good education here in engineering. We're still providing, in many ways, the best, in many disciplines.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: You're exactly right,
Markos. That's a great point. China is graduating
five times the engineers we are.

MR. TAMBAKERAS: Right.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: And that's the future for manufacturing, there's no doubt about it. I know

our National Association of Manufacturers, with our Dream It, Do It, we're trying to encourage people to go into the sciences and trying to change that trend, because 40 years from now we're not going to be where we are if we don't get this changed.

We've got a Sputnik out there, and it's a different type of an animal right now than what we faced with Russia when we finally went after Sputnik at that time and turned this country around at that time for R&D. We need the same sort of thing right now. We need that push. It is urgent, it needs to be done, and it is a problem.

#### Congressman?

CONGRESSMAN MANZULLO: R&D can take other subtle forms. The FAA is proposing a \$7 million cutback in the area of licensing aircraft. Now, this is insanity going to stupidity, because that's at the end of the R&D cycle. When the airline guys have been coming into the office saying, here, we're done with a product, now FAA says, now you've got to wait. That's not where you cut back.

Also, that Piscantany up there? That's on the BRAC list. I don't know if you're aware of that. But it just goes to show, there is no manufacturing mentality in this country. Sixty years ago, somebody

said, "everybody has to go to college." It was no longer glamorous, nothing exciting about working in a factory. Now we are suffering, big-time.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: That's why we're changing that mentality, and that's what we're working for. What's why we have this council, and that's why we have people like Secretary Bond to push the fact that we're not only looking at changing the policy, we're looking at changing the systems, too. That was very important that we talk about, so we have some reaction time here that's been reduced to try to make some of these things change.

Are there any comments from the public now on this? Yes, sir.

MR. BARGO: Frank Bargo with the National Association of Manufacturers. I would like to underscore the urgency. I don't hear enough urgency around the table for this issue.

Now, as we speak, some Federal national labs are laying off engineers now, or they're just about to. That's just not acceptable. We have a problem, I agree, with engineering. But over half of our engineering students come from overseas right now because of our visa programs.

There is a perception that we're a more

hostile country now to foreigners visiting us, and that enrollment has gone down. We need to get it up. It's something we can do quickly, and we should staple a green card to every diploma, and do everything we can to keep them here while we build up enrollment.

Also, engineering is still a hostile area to women. We're losing half of our prospective engineers in the future because this is not a friendly enough career to women, and we need to do something about that.

Also, I would commend to you to look at what other governments or other countries are doing. I think it would be very good, Mr. Secretary, if the Commerce Department staff could do a quick analysis of what Canada is doing with its 20/20 program, what the French are doing with their new industrial policy, and the Germans, the European Union, the Japanese, the Australians, et cetera. You read that, and you see we are really falling behind. So, really, I commend your work, but I think there needs to be a greater sense of urgency.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Frank, thank you very much. Frank Bargo, from the National Association of Manufacturers, is one of the senior vice presidents for Trade and Policy. Frank, we appreciate your comments

there.

Anybody else? Over here.

MR. RIFER: I'm Matt Rifer. I'm the legislative director for Congressman Aylers from Michigan. Let me first say that my boss is a person who understands that urgency. He has that sense. We also welcome Mr. Keller to Washington. He's one of our constituents. It's good to see you, sir.

We really appreciate the work of the Workforce Subcommittee. The statistics that we've got in here are really going to be helpful for us. We'll incorporate those into talking points that we have got as we talk to other members and other staff people about the Key program, particularly, and the funding for that, as well as basically R&D, basic science research funding.

So, you're preaching to the choir when you're talking to Mr. Aylers, and he's going to continue to push with his colleagues to get the point in there.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Well, thank you very much. It's good to have an ally for manufacturing, for sure.

Mike?

MR. NOWAK: Maybe I glossed over it, but certainly, if there's an inter-agency group working

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

with the Department of Education, I would certainly think we ought to be trying to look at what we can do at the high school/middle school levels, because there aren't a lot of kids in school these days, in my perception, that get fed that engineering's a great place to go.

I mean, their role models are not engineers, unless it's your mom or dad, or have an uncle. I just don't think we have that. We don't have the Sputnik programs where people are looking out there and saying, boy, I want to work on that.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: And it's up to us to do that. I know National Association of Manufacturers has a Dream It, Do It program now that's going to be going nationwide to try to change that imagine, and we need to coordinate that with out inter-agencies.

Mr. Secretary?

MR. FRINK: Yes. A couple things. One, my new friend, Chief Counsel Bradley Knox, has advised me that the report that Frank Bargo was mentioning, the comparison of what other countries are doing, is available, Don, and he's going to make that available to me. So, you and I ought to get together on that, and I'd like to talk to you further about it.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: That's great.

MR. FRINK: To the point of education and what Mike was just mentioning, I went back to my alma mater area of Southern California and did two talks, and one was before quite a few students, probably about 800. Interestingly, as I've been doing these talks, the question I'm getting most often from students is, how do you start a business? I've had recent reports that there are more young people looking at starting businesses than wanting to be doctors.

I don't know that there's any scholastic endeavor to respond to that, but my old school does not have any of the programs that I took. I was going to be a tool and dye maker. I studied to be a mechanical engineer. They're all gone.

The good news is, I went to Santa Anna,
California to speak before the Chamber of Commerce, and
they have a new high school starting there that is
going to be totally dedicated to vocational studies and
addressing the areas specifically with nothing else.
Those would be the kind of models that we're going to
look at to help see how we can propagate that around
the country through the means that I've discussed. So,
a lot of work to be done, and it's on our radar.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: I would also recommend that you look at St. Louis Ryken Technology, which is

funded fully by private donations and does all technical hands-on training. It's an outstanding operation, also.

MR. FRINK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Frank?

MR. BARGO: I'm sorry. Just one more thing.

Congressman Frank Wolf -- Congress and others, tomorrow is having a press conference at 9:30 to announce a conference on manufacturing and innovation on these things, and I certainly hope that we can count on your support.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you, Frank. Yes.

Any other comments from the public? Steve?

MR. LEWIS: I'm Steve Lewis from Ford Motor

Company. I'm here just to highlight on R&D, not only
educational things, which are very important, but the

process -- which is equally important. I remind people
that Ford Motor Company started back in 1903 doing

process. It was process innovation that led to a

revolution in terms of overall business.

So, strategically, I think it's very important that we consider process part of R&D innovation. Many times it gets discarded, but many of the leaders that are sitting around the table realize that process is very important in their day-to-day life. To that end,

where we can apply process innovation to areas of health care or other activities that will help reduce costs, that's a good thing that will allow people to take advantage of that at a lower cost. So, I don't want to discard process innovation.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Steve, thank you.

That's a good point. Of course, our own NIST, through the Baldage Program, is strictly process-oriented.

Secretary Bond, you might comment on that.

MR. BOND: Yes. The quality movement continues. We're trying to expand its reach to other sectors and continue to drive that program. It has real benefits. We also have a number of these other things that have been mentioned, kind of on the radar screen, whether it is the President's National Medal of Technology, which I think is one way we could hold up role models.

We don't do a good enough job of that. We have outreach efforts going on to women and kids, the Get Tech partnership with NAM that we've had through Commerce for a while. The health care initiative that the President's mentioned, one of the really key processes to bring IT to a late-adopting industry, save you all money, provide better care. So, a number of these things.

There was mention of high school. New Secretary Spellings. That is her main focus, is to take No Child Left Behind and really apply it at the high school level as well. So, a lot of work can be done. I think the take-away for me, is the things you're identifying are the things we have on our radar screens. We just need to work more closely together. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you very much, Mr.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Secretary.

Any other comments? John?

MR. FRINK: At this point, I'd like to have the council recognize another Congressman, Congressman Mike Turner, who is here with us. We'd like to thank him for joining us.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you very much, Mr. Congressman.

If there are no more comments, I would like to see, is there consensus on the board that we would have a letter go forward to Secretary Guttierrez through our Secretary, and make sure this is one of the priorities from the council?

(A chorus of ayes)

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay. That is so done. Thank you.

At this time, I would like Markos Tambakeras,

chairman of the Subcommittee on Advocacy and International Trade, our market access, to give his committee report. Markos? 

## SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

## SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADVOCACY AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE

By Mr. Markos Tambakeras

MR. TAMBAKERAS: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At the request of the council, this subcommittee has prepared a letter to Secretary Guttierrez on the subject of CAFTA-DR, and I'm going to read that as a specific recommendation on the part of the subcommittee.

The letter reads as follows: "The United States and six countries--Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and the Dominican Republic--have signed the U.S.-Central America-Dominican Republic Free Trade Agreement, CAFTA-DR.

This proposed free trade agreement promotes trade liberalization between the United States and these six countries, and will immediately open the Central American market to most American exporters.

Perhaps of even of more importance, it sets the stage for greater commercially meaningful trade agreements. The CAFTA-DR agreement requires an up-ordown vote of approval in both Houses, and action on this agreement is expected within the next few months.

Therefore, operating in our role as an

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

advisory body to the Secretary of Commerce, and on behalf of the manufacturing sector of the U.S. economy, the President's Manufacturing Council recommends that the Secretary of Commerce enthusiastically support the ratification of CAFTA-DR. CAFTA-DR will help enable major benefits for the United States, especially for U.S. manufacturing exports.

In 2004, U.S. exports to the six countries covered by CAFTA-DR totaled almost \$16 billion:

Dominican Republic, \$4.3 billion; Costa Rica, \$3.3 billion; Honduras, \$3.1 billion; Guatemala, \$2.5 billion; El Salvador, \$1.9 billion; and Nicaragua, \$600 million. Moreover, of the \$15.7 billion, \$11.8 billion, or 75 percent, was manufactured exports, including \$4 billion in machinery and transportation equipment alone.

U.S. manufacturers would benefit not only from duty-free access to these substantial markets, but would have preferential access compared to European and Asian competitors who still have to pay relatively high tariffs.

Passage of CAFTA-DR would immediately eliminate tariffs on over 80 percent of U.S. manufacturer exports to the six Central American and Caribbean countries, with the remaining tariffs to be

eliminated within 10 years. Key U.S. exports will immediately receive duty-free treatment.

Just to kind of digress for a moment, I received some estimates from NAM and MAPI, and they estimate that CAFTA-DR will provide U.S. manufacturers approximately \$1 billion of additional manufactured goods' exports, creating some 12,000 related job opportunities for American workers.

Without the agreement, the U.S. stands to use up to \$4 billion in existing exports to CAFTA countries, and could affect up to 48,000 jobs in the U.S. Failure to approve CAFTA-DR would effectively shift business from Central America to Asia, and these countries would lose their apparel industry to Asia, particularly, potentially China, and more than half a million people in that region could be out of work. In short, we don't see a down side to this."

So, in closing, the letter to the Secretary reads, "In addition to these tangible trade benefits, direct foreign investment will grow as investors gain confidence that their economies will be increasingly rules-based, transparent, and stable.

Finally, CAFTA-DR has the potential to promote democracy and stability in the entire hemisphere by helping build the long-term economic stability of this

region. Thank you for your consideration of this recommendation."

I also want to thank and acknowledge my two partners on the subcommittee, Jim Owens, who is the chairman and CEO of Caterpillar, Inc., and Harding Stowe, who is the president and owner of Stowe Mills, Inc.

Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Markos, thank you very much. Market access is extremely important, especially in the manufacturing arena. You did an outstanding job, your committee, on this report. We really appreciate it.

I'd like to open it up now to the council to see if there are any questions or any comments.

Harding?

MR. STOWE: Don, I'd like to follow up with it. A significant portion of this business is related to textiles and apparel. I can tell you today, the American textile industry, which still exists with a great number of companies, that Central America is in many cases the largest area of customers that we have.

Some of my competitors who have reviewed it in depth say that up to 88 to 90 percent of the value of their products end up in Central America, and we need

an apparel-producing base near the United States that can compete with China.

China is trying to dominate this part of the business, but for strategic reasons, Central America has great opportunity for us. It's close by, it has a very solid workforce, and as I said, it's a great customer base for our industry.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Any other comments?

Karen?

MS. WRIGHT: The other thing we talked about earlier, too, is that it does support fledgling democratic countries. Certainly, given that it is in our backyard, it's to our advantage anyway to try and help them to increase their opportunities.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Any other comments from anyone else on the council?

(No response)

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Definitely, free market access, especially with the Americas, is extremely important. We've already seen some change over the last, say, five years since we've had NAFTA. We need CAFTA-DR. So, I think you gave a great report.

I would like to now open it up to the public.

Do we have any comments on this from anybody in the public? We'd like to hear from any of our guests or

anybody in the public on this particular area. (No response) CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: No comments. We seem to have agreement on the council that this letter would go forward to Secretary Guttierrez as a recommendation from our council, representing our constituency. Is everybody in favor of that? (A chorus of ayes) CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay. So moved. So, we'll make sure that that goes forward. 

\_\_\_

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT:

Now I'd like to kind of open this up as a general discussion of some other areas, other than our subcommittees.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

What are some new areas that you might feel are important? Does anybody on the council right now have any other discussion to throw out on the table?

MS. WRIGHT: If I may, I'd like to talk about a couple of things. I'm really sorry that the Congressman left, because he threw out a pretty pithy thing at the beginning where he said, don't ask us for any more money because there isn't any more. I'd like to say that I would like for him to take back to Congress, don't ask us for any more tax money, because the same is true.

Right now, if you look at manufacturing, we have fixed costs of about 22 percent imposed on us because of all kinds of regulation that gets passed time and again by Congress.

Some of the specific items that we have talked about as a group, and also when I've talked to lots of manufacturers across the country, kind of top on our list would be Sarbanes-Oxley, specifically the 404 section of that rule.

What we have here, is a very expensive, non-productive tax imposed on business. Just last year, for example, there was somewhere in the neighborhood of over \$5 billion in compliance costs for Sarbanes-Oxley just to get started. That's for the top Fortune 1,000 companies, not to mention all of the hundreds and hundreds of smaller businesses that are public companies.

So you have billions and billions of dollars now being spent to comply with a law that essentially says that all businesses, public businesses, are guilty and have to prove themselves innocent.

So we think this is something that really needs to be addressed by Congress and find a better way to comply with this law that doesn't impose such a huge cost on manufacturing.

The second thing, is repealing the death tax or estate that. That's the second thing on our list. This is another cost that everybody, public and private companies, bear. When we're talking about R&D, most of the innovation and the job creation comes from private, small family businesses in this country. The estate tax essentially means that it's very difficult to pass on a business to the people who are most concerned about it being the next generation.

When you have to buy your company back from the government, and at the rate of 55 percent, it makes it very difficult to pass it on. So what happens is, companies end up having to sell in order to pay the estate tax. That's the bottom line.

If you want R&D, if you want innovation, if you want the people who are most interested in passing on a business or making it grow, that would be the people that started it and who are working in it. So, that right there, the bill to repeal the estate tax, is currently with the Senate.

I would say that would be one of the most easy-to-pass, most innovative, progressive, positive moves that the Senate could make this year, is to repeal that estate tax and do away with a really bad law that's been imposed on business for a long time.

The other thing that is concerning to all of us, is energy. Certainly the high cost of energy imposes a big burden on manufacturing. It needs to be acknowledged that technology has caught up with conscience. We know how to recover natural gas and oil without despoiling the environment.

There needs to be an acknowledgement of that, and make it possible for American exploration and production people in those businesses to start

recovering the oil and gas that's available on this continent. There is lots of it here, but regulation is preventing us from recovering that energy. So, we need that as soon as possible, too.

Social Security and health care are both really important issues to all of us. Again, those are regulations that impose increased costs on all business and have to be addressed.

Another thing that we talked about at some length, is the intellectual property concerns. If you are a global company, certainly you're going to be doing business in China, in India, and other places like that.

We would like protection so that the innovation and the development that we do is not stolen and then piggy-backed on in other countries, which is exactly what is happening today.

So, those would be some of the things that I think that Congress could do for us. We don't want money, we just want deregulation.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay, Karen. So, Sarbanes-Oxley, tweaking that, the death tax, energy, Social Security, and IPR are important points that we need to look at in the future. I think that's a good list.

How about anybody else on the council here?

Do we have any other comments on anything else? Fred?

MR. KELLER: Mr. Chairman, I would just bring to the council's attention the situation that is arising in the auto sector. The auto sector is under a lot of stress after years of price deflation.

Too many suppliers in the supply chain are on the brink of bankruptcy. That is bad news, in and of itself. But there is an interesting dilemma here, in that many of those that are not going into bankruptcy are really hurt by those going into bankruptcy in two ways.

One, is that as people -- you know, you used to think of bankruptcy as the thing you didn't want to do, and now it's becoming a business model as people go into bankruptcy and actually shed costs.

Those who are lower down in the food chain may not get paid as a result of the bankruptcy, and those that are going into bankruptcy, in Chapter 11, may very well have lower costs as they shed some of those costs, and they become more cost competitive, if you will, than those who are not going into bankruptcy. So, it's creating a very potentially dangerous situation in the auto sector that I think we need to be aware of.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thanks, Fred. I think

that is definitely something on our list.

Anybody else?

MR. BOND: Just to follow up on that, I did want to draw to the attention of the group the work that we are doing through the Department of Commerce and NIST with U.S. CAR, an automotive industry consortium, really, to look at next generation technologies on wireless factory floors, on integrating the supply chain, on lift devices, and important technology for many manufacturers, and computer modeling as well, to keep that innovation going in that fundamental industry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you, sir.

MR. NOWAK: Another point on the bankruptcy, is it's certainly true, if it starts in the auto industry, it's going to go other places. You've seen some in the airline industry already, people trying to get more competitive by doing it. It's going to spread. Hopefully we can head it off before it gets there.

#### CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Markos?

MR. TAMBAKERAS: I would just bring up a point I made with Congressman Manzullo, and it's under the headline of raw materials and China's trade practices, and the impact on U.S. manufacturing. We've had this

with steel and many other metals. We now are seeing it with tungsten.

As I've mentioned, the price has gone from \$60 to \$90 a ton to \$300-plus a ton in a matter of a few weeks. Eighty percent of the supply comes from China. Why is this important? Because every time we machine anything in the manufacturing sector, we use tungsten as the key material for the tools that are used in the metalworking sector.

So, this is simply under the overall headline of raw materials and fair trade. This is yet one more issue we're facing as manufacturers, where the bulk of the supply is influenced heavily by Asia, and in particular, China.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Would it be fair to call that a commodity dollar transfer? We've got a situation here where the commodities are being used to manipulate markets. That's the big thing that we're really concerned about more than anything else.

 $$\operatorname{MR}$.$  TAMBAKERAS: Yes. And it's inflationary and it adds to the cost.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Exactly. Sure.

MR. TAMBAKERAS: So it has inflation.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Because the markets aren't free. They're being controlled.

MR. TAMBAKERAS: Plus, the material is not available. Particularly hard hit will be small and medium manufacturers who run small operations whose costs are going to go, again, very high, and potentially, like we saw with tool and dye, we may see other sectors of the economy becoming uncompetitive because of their machining costs going up. So, it's in the overall umbrella of raw materials, but exactly the point you made.

MR. McGREGOR: Or lack of the product.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Yes. Well, right.

MR. McGREGOR: There's a shortage, potentially, created. Well, that's an imposed shortage, controlled markets.

MR. TAMBAKERAS: Controlled markets. And in the case of tungsten, we have within our control to do something about it because we do have stockpiles within the DLA that can be used to relieve the pressure. But tungsten is a symptom of a broader problem, and I think it's the broader problem.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: I'd like to now open it up to the general public.

Jim?

MR. McGREGOR: Just one quick comment to back Karen up on this repeal of the estate tax. I cannot

say how critical that is to a lot of the manufacturing industries, and other types of industries, in this country.

For people that are second and third generation in these family-owned businesses that have worked a lifetime, or whether it be a farmer or a land developer, or whatever, this issue is critical to the future of a lot of jobs in the United States of America.

MR. KELLER: It might be worth making the distinction here, too, that we're talking about an estate tax that may be different from what some people think of in the estate tax.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: It's only if you die, though. Right, Fred?

MR. KELLER: It's only if you die. That's true. But the concept of a small business having to be sold is different from taxing assets that someone may have in some liquid form.

Businessmen, as we all know, sitting around the table, have fixed assets that are not very liquid. In a private company that has to literally be sold to some third party in order to pay taxes, that kills the business. I don't think people understand that.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: You don't get the

1	highest price when you have to sell?
2	MR. KELLER: Right.
3	MS. WRIGHT: It kills the business.
4	Typically, they're in small towns. It gets sold to a
5	big company. Then they close it down and move it to
6	China.
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
24	
25	

# 

# 

•

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Let me open this up to the public. Do we have any comments from anybody in the public on any of these issues, or any other issues?

Yes, Fred?

MR. NICHOLS: Fred Nichols with the NAM.

Later this week, the President's Tax Reform Commission is going to be meeting. They're going to be looking at specific proposals for overall tax reform. As you'll recall, in the manufacturing report there was one recommendation that was given to Treasury to look at ways to reform the Tax Code, to improve innovation and growth in manufacturing. I just want to make sure this council has looked at the opportunity to weigh in, because that will probably close within the next 30 days.

 $\label{eq:CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Fred, thank you very $$ $$ \text{much.}$ 

Mr. Secretary, do we have that on our agenda?

MR. FRINK: I was just going to comment on

Markos' report on tungsten. I'd have to review the

letter that you sent, but if your letter could quantify

that the market has been controlled, or if it hasn't,

if you could give us something to that effect, then we

feed a lot of the information that USTR gets so they can bring that to the table. It could be a WTO violation, not just for the current fix, but moving forward. So, if you can make that effort, that would be something we could take forward.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you.

General public, or any of our congressional guests also, are there any comments from anybody? Yes, sir.

VOICE: -- take a look at the lists of -production, pretty much China controls the -- so from
every type of -- you name a metal, you name the type of
power production, whether it's natural gas -- long-term
contracts with -- countries that provide these, the
impact is -- so that's something that's important to
keep in mind.

The other thing is, when it comes to container shipments, most of that's run by Southeast Asian countries. So if we did have a problem -- so that's just something to keep in mind.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Thank you very much.

Well, if there are no more comments, I would like to sort of bring this to a close.

Karen, is there anything else that you would suggest?

MS. WRIGHT: Well, I just wanted to acknowledge that Frank over here said something really great. I think this should be in the paper, to staple a green card to every foreign-trained engineer's diploma. I think that's a great idea.

We should acknowledge that they would like a shot at the American dream. That's why they come here. If we could keep them here, that would be a huge advantage to us. That would be a fairly simple thing to do, to say if you got a diploma in engineering, or a science degree in the United States, that guarantees you a shot at citizenship. That's a great idea.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: That's great.

Frank, you seem to be getting in the news a lot of times. Do you have that pair of pliers with you?

MR. BARGO: Not today.

CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Okay. Well, that refers to a pair of pliers. As he said, the raw material in a pair of pliers made in China, we can't even start to compete with. We sell it for a dollar, they sell it for forty cents. So, you're back in the news again, Frank. Good idea.

Jim, do you have a comment?

MR. McGREGOR: Mr. Secretary, in Fred's

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150

comment about the President's tax proposal coming up and the 30-day window, can we be sure that we are engaged in that issue and understand? I didn't know that that opportunity was coming up. If the window is going to be that short, we probably ought to understand the issue a little bit better, and maybe get engaged. CHAIRMAN WAINWRIGHT: Go to nam.org and you'll find it. We'll make sure. 

Well, that brings this meeting to a conclusion, unless we have any other comments from anybody else. I want to thank everybody. I believe this was our fourth get-together. It was outstanding. We appreciate all the comments, appreciate the guests, appreciate the council members and your comments. We look forward to the next meeting.

Remember, manufacturing has to be number one in the United States. Thank you very much.

(Whereupon, at 12:02 p.m. the meeting was concluded.)

## 

# 

 C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings of a meeting of The Manufacturing Council, U.S. Department of Commerce, held on Wednesday, May 11, 2005, were transcribed as herein appears, and this is the original of transcript thereof.

# WILLIAM J. MOFFITT

Official Court Reporter

My Commission expires: April 14, 2009

MOFFITT REPORTING ASSOCIATES (301) 390-5150